arXiv:1505.05326v1 [math.FA] 20 May 2015

PROPERTIES OF SINGULAR INTEGRAL OPERATORS $S_{\alpha,\beta}$

AMIT SAMANTA AND SANTANU SARKAR

ABSTRACT. For $\alpha, \beta \in L^\infty(S^1)$, the singular integral operator $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ on $L^2(S^1)$ is defined by $S_{\alpha,\beta}f := \alpha Pf + \beta Qf$, where P denotes the orthogonal projection of $L^2(S^1)$ onto the Hardy space $H^2(S^1)$, and Q denotes the orthogonal projection onto $H^2(S^1)^\perp$. In a recent paper Nakazi and Yamamoto have studied the normality and self-adjointness of $S_{\alpha,\beta}$. This work has shown that $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ may have analogous properties to that of the Toeplitz operator. In this paper we study several other properties of $S_{\alpha,\beta}$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $L^2 = L^2(S^1)$ denotes the the Hilbert space of square integrable functions on the circle $S^1 = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$ with respect to the normalized Lebesgue measure. The inner product of two functions $f, g \in L^2$ is given by

$$\langle f, g\rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} f(e^{i\theta})\bar{g}(e^{i\theta})d\theta.$$

The norm will be denoted by $\| \,.\, \|$, that is $\| f \|^2 = \langle f, f\rangle$. Let $L^\infty = L^\infty(S^1)$ denotes the space of all essentially bounded measurable functions on S^1. The norm of a function $f \in L^\infty$ is given by $\| f \|_\infty = \text{ess sup}_{S^1}|f|$. Let H^2 denotes the usual Hardy space on S^1. That is it consists of all f in L^2 with all the negative Fourier coefficients equal to zero. Similarly we define H^∞, to be the space of all L^∞ functions with all the negative Fourier coefficients zero. Let $H_2^\perp$ denotes the orthogonal complement of H^2 in L^2. Let P and Q denote the orthogonal projection of L^2 onto H^2 and $H^{2\perp}$ respectively. Thus $P + Q = I$, where I is the identity operator on L^2.

Let S be the singular integral operator defined by

$$(Sf)(z) = \frac{1}{\pi i}\int_{S^1} \frac{f(w)}{w - z}dw.$$

This operator is well-studied ([2], Vol.I, p.12). S can be written in terms of P and $Q : S = P - Q$. The operator S has natural generalization to the operator $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ where $S_{\alpha,\beta}(\alpha, \beta \in L^\infty)$ on L^2 is defined by

$$S_{\alpha,\beta}f := \alpha Pf + \beta Qf, \quad f \in L^2.$$

Some properties of $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ related to the norm (or weighted norm), invertibility, boundedness (with weight) etc have been studied in ([3], [4] , [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12]). Some of these results are generalizations of properties of S. In a recent paper ([10]) the normality and self-adjointness of the operator $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ are studied. This work has shown that $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ may have analogous

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 45E10, 47B35, 47B20, 30D55.

Key words and phrases. Singular integral operator, Toeplitz operator, Hardy space.

The first author is supported by the NBHM Postdoctoral Fellowship, Govt. of India. The second author is supported by the Feinberg Postdoctoral Fellowship of the Weizmann Institute of Science.

properties to the Toeplitz operator. In this paper we found several analogous properties of $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ corresponding to that of the Toeplitz operator.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give a characterization of $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ in terms of its matrix representation. In Section 3 we discuss about its operator norm. In Section 4 we give characterization of $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ as a commutator of $S_{z,\bar{z}}$. Section 5 deals with the invariant subspace and reducing subspace of $S_{z,\bar{z}}$. In Section 6 we discuss about composition of two operators S_{α_1,β_1} and S_{α_2,β_2}. Also we study their commutativity. In Section 7 we give some results related to the compactness of $S_{\alpha,\beta}$. Section 8 deals with the spectrum of $S_{\alpha,\beta}$. In Section 9 we discuss about the injectivity of $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ and its adjoint.

In order to compare our results with that of the Toeplitz operator the corresponding properties of the Toeplitz operator is worth mentioning. For $\phi \in L^\infty$ the Toeplitz operator T_ϕ on H^2 is defined by $T_\phi(f) = P(\phi f)$ for all $f \in H^2$. The following mentioned properties of the Topelitz operator are well-known and can be found in ([1], Chapter 3 and Chapter 1).

- A bounded operator on H^2 is a Toeplitz operator if and only if its matrix with respect to the orthonormal basis $\{e^{in\theta}\}$ has constant diagonal entries. That is $A_{m_1,n_1} = A_{m_2,n_2}$ whenever $m_1 - n_1 = m_2 - n_2$ where $(A_{m,n})_{m,n\geq 0}$ denotes the (m,n)th entry of the matrix.
- $\| T_\phi \| =$ Spectral radius of $T_\phi = \| \phi \|_\infty$.
- The commutant of the unilateral shift acting on H^2 is T_ϕ such that $\phi \in H^\infty$.
- *(Beurling's Theorem).* Every invariant subspace of the unilateral shift acting on H^2 other than $\{0\}$ has the form ψH^2, where ψ is an inner function, i.e. $\psi \in H^\infty, |\psi| = 1$ a.e.
- The only reducing subspaces of the unilateral shift are $\{0\}$ and H^2.
- Let $\psi, \phi \in L^\infty$. Then $T_\psi T_\phi$ is a Toeplitz operator if and only if ψ is co-analytic or ϕ is analytic. In both of these cases $T_\psi T_\phi = T_{\psi\phi}$. It follows that the product of two Toeplitz operator is zero if and only if at least one of the factor is zero. Also it follows that if both ϕ and ψ are analytic or both ϕ and ψ are co-analytic, then they commute with each other. In fact there can arise one more case when T_ϕ commutes with T_ψ and that is $a\phi + b\psi$ is constant for some constants a and b not both equal to zero.
- The only compact Toeplitz operator is the zero operator. Toeplitz operator can not even get closer to compact operators, more preciously if $\phi \in L^\infty$ and K is a compact operator then $\| T_\phi - K \| \geq \| T_\phi \|$.
- Spectral radius of the Toeplitz operator is $\| \phi \|_\infty$. If ϕ is analytic or co-analytic then $\sigma(T_\phi) = \overline{\phi(\mathbb{D})}$, where $\mathbb{D}$ is the open unit disc in $\mathbb{C}$. If ϕ is continuous (so that it can be cosidered as a closed curve in $\mathbb{C}$), then
$$\sigma(T_\phi) = \text{Range}(\phi) \cup \{a \in \mathbb{C} : a \notin \text{Range}(\phi) \text{ and } \text{ind}_a \phi \neq 0\},$$
where $\text{ind}_a \phi = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\phi \frac{1}{z-a} dz$.
- *(The Coburn Alternative).* If ϕ is a non-zero function in L^∞, then at least one of T_ϕ and T_ϕ^* is injective.

We end this section with a well-known theorem of F. and M. Riesz, which will be used several times in this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *(The F. and M. Riesz Theorem). If $f \in H^2$ and the set $\{e^{i\theta} : f(e^{i\theta}) = 0\}$ has positive measure, then f is identically zero.*

It follows easily from the theorem that the same is true if f is a co-analytic function in L^2.

2. MATRIX

The following theorem gives a characterization $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ in terms of its matrix representation.

Theorem 2.1. *Let T be a bounded linear operator on L^2. Then $T = S_{\alpha,\beta}$ for some L^∞ functions α and β iff its matrix with respect to the orthonormal basis $\{z^n\}_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}$ has the form*

$$\begin{bmatrix}
\ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & & & & & \\
\ddots & b_{-1} & b_{-2} & b_{-3} & & & & & \\
\ddots & b_0 & b_{-1} & b_{-2} & a_{-3} & & & & \\
\ddots & b_1 & b_0 & b_{-1} & a_{-2} & a_{-3} & & & \\
\ddots & b_2 & b_1 & b_0 & a_{-1} & a_{-2} & a_{-3} & & \\
 & b_3 & b_2 & b_1 & \boldsymbol{a_0} & a_{-1} & a_{-2} & a_{-3} & \\
 & & b_3 & b_2 & a_1 & a_0 & a_{-1} & a_{-2} & \ddots \\
 & & & b_3 & a_2 & a_1 & a_0 & a_{-1} & \ddots \\
 & & & & a_3 & a_2 & a_1 & a_0 & \ddots \\
 & & & & & a_3 & a_2 & a_1 & \ddots \\
 & & & & & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots
\end{bmatrix}$$

for some constants a_n and b_n, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ (the set of all integers); more precisely its (m,n)th entry is a_{m-n} or b_{m-n} accordingly whether $n \geq 0$ or $n \leq -1$. (In the matrix boldface denotes the $(0,0)$ position). In this case $a_n = \hat{\alpha}(n)$ and $b_n = \hat{\beta}(n)$.

Proof. First assume that $T = S_{\alpha,\beta}$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in L^\infty$. Since $Tz^n = \alpha z^n$ if $n \geq 0$ and $Tz^n = \beta z^n$ if $n \leq -1$, it follows that $\langle Tz^n, z^m \rangle$ is $\hat{\alpha}(m-n)$ or $\hat{\beta}(m-n)$ accordingly whether $n \geq 0$ or $n \leq -1$. Therefore the matrix of T with respect to the orthonormal basis $\{z^n\}_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}$ has the given form with $a_n = \hat{\alpha}(n)$ and $b_n = \hat{\beta}(n)$. This proves the necessary part.

For the converse part, assume that the matrix of T has the given form. Define $\alpha := T1$ and $\beta = zTz^{-1}$. Then $\alpha, \beta \in L^2$, and

$$\alpha(z) = (T1)(z) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \langle T1, z^m \rangle z^m = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} a_m z^m,$$

since $\langle T1, z^m \rangle = (m, 0)$ th entry in the matrix $= a_m$. Similarly

$$\beta(z) = zTz^{-1} = z\left(\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \langle Tz^{-1}, z^m \rangle z^m \right) = z\left(\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} b_{m+1} z^m \right) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} b_m z^m.$$

If $n \geq 0$,

$$Tz^n = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \langle Tz^n, z^m \rangle z^m = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} a_{m-n} z^m = z^n \left(\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} a_{m-n} z^{m-n} \right) = z^n \alpha(z).$$

In a similar way, $Tz^n = z^n\beta(z)$ if if $n \leq -1$. Since T is linear, we can say that $Tf = \alpha f$ if f is a trigonometric polynomial in H^2, and $Tf = \beta f$ if f is a trigonometric polynomial in $H^{2\perp}$. Now, if $f \in H^2$, then there is a sequence f_n of trigonometric polynomials in H^2 such that $f_n \to f$ in L^2, so that $\alpha f_n = Tf_n \to Tf$ in L^2, since T is bounded. Now along a subsequence $f_{n_k} \to f$ point wise almost everywhere. Hence $\alpha f_{n_k} \to \alpha f$ point wise almost everywhere. So we can conclude that $Tf = \alpha f$ almost everywhere for all $f \in H^2$. In a similar way we can show that $Tf = \beta f$ for all f in $H^{2\perp}$. So, we have $Tf = \alpha Pf + \beta Qf$ for all $f \in L^2$ or $T = S_{\alpha,\beta}$. It remains to prove that α and β are in L^∞. But this proof is standard and we skip the proof here, because in another occasion we shall prove the same thing(see the last part of the proof of Theorem 4.3 in section 4). □

3. OPERATOR NORM

Let $\alpha, \beta \in L^\infty$. In [5] (Theorem 2.1), Nakazi, Yamamoto has given the following formula for the operator norm of $S_{\alpha,\beta}$:

$$||S_{\alpha,\beta}|| = \inf_{k \in H^\infty} \left|\left| \frac{|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2}{2} + \sqrt{|\alpha\bar{\beta} - k|^2 + \left(\frac{|\alpha|^2 - |\beta|^2}{2}\right)^2} \right|\right|_\infty$$

We shall use some of the following results related to the operator norm in future. Though they can be deduced from the above formula, we shall give direct simple proofs. For $\beta \in L^\infty$, we define the operator $\tilde{T_\beta}$ on $H^{2^\perp}$ given by

$$\tilde{T_\beta}(f) = Q(\beta f),\ f \in H^{2^\perp}.$$

Theorem 3.1. *Let* $\alpha, \beta \in L^\infty$.
(i) *If* $\alpha_n \to \alpha$ *and* $\beta_n \to \beta$ *in* L^∞ *norm then* $S_{\alpha_n,\beta_n} \to S_{\alpha,\beta}$ *in the operator norm.*
(ii) $\max\{||\alpha||_\infty, ||\beta||_\infty\} \leq ||S_{\alpha,\beta}|| \leq \sqrt{||\alpha||_\infty^2 + ||\beta||_\infty^2}$.
(iii) *If* $\alpha\bar{\beta} \in H^\infty$ *then* $||S_{\alpha\beta}|| = \max\{||\alpha||_\infty, ||\beta||_\infty\}$
(iv) *If* $|\alpha| = |\beta| =$ *constant and* $\alpha\bar{\beta} \in \frac{H^{2\perp}}{H^2}$ *i.e.* $\alpha\bar{\beta}$ *can be written as quotient of a function in* $H^{2\perp}$ *and a function in* H^2*, then* $||S_{\alpha,\beta}|| = \sqrt{||\alpha||_\infty^2 + ||\beta||_\infty^2}$.
(v) *There exists* α, β *such that* $\max\{||\alpha||_\infty, ||\beta||_\infty\} < ||S_{\alpha,\beta}|| < \sqrt{||\alpha||_\infty^2 + ||\beta||_\infty^2}$.

Proof. (i) Proof follows from the fact that, for any $f \in L^2$,

$$||(S_{\alpha_n,\beta_n} - S_{\alpha,\beta})f|| = ||(\alpha_n - \alpha)Pf + (\beta_n - \beta)Qf|| \leq ||\alpha_n - \alpha||_\infty ||f|| + ||\beta_n - \beta||_\infty ||f||.$$

(ii)

$$\begin{aligned} ||S_{\alpha,\beta}|| &= \sup_{f \in L^2, ||f||=1} ||S_{\alpha,\beta} f|| \\ &\geq \sup_{f \in H^2, ||f||=1} ||\alpha f|| \\ &\geq \sup_{f \in H^2, ||f||=1} ||P(\alpha f)|| \\ &= \sup_{f \in H^2, ||f||=1} ||T_\alpha f|| = ||T_\alpha||. \end{aligned}$$

But we know that $||T_\alpha|| = ||\alpha||_\infty$. Therefore $||S_{\alpha,\beta}|| \geq ||\alpha||_\infty$. In a similar way, using the fact $||\tilde{T}_\beta|| = ||\beta||_\infty$ (the proof of this fact is similar to the proof of operator norm of the Toeplitz operator), we can prove that $||S_{\alpha,\beta}|| \geq ||\beta||_\infty$. Hence $||S_{\alpha,\beta}|| \geq \max\big\{||\alpha||_\infty, ||\beta||_\infty\big\}$.

For any $f \in L^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} ||S_{\alpha,\beta}f|| &\leq ||\alpha||_\infty ||Pf|| + ||\beta||_\infty ||Qf|| \\ &\leq \big(||\alpha||_\infty^2 + ||\beta||_\infty^2\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \big(||Pf||^2 + ||Qf||^2\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \sqrt{||\alpha||_\infty^2 + ||\beta||_\infty^2}\, ||f||. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $||S_{\alpha,\beta}|| \leq \sqrt{||\alpha||_\infty^2 + ||\beta||_\infty^2}$.

(iii) Since $\alpha\bar{\beta} \in H^\infty$, for all $f \in L^2$ we have $\langle \alpha Pf, \beta Qf\rangle = \langle \alpha\bar{\beta}, \overline{Pf}Qf\rangle = 0$. Thus

$$||S_{\alpha,\beta}f||^2 = ||\alpha Pf||^2 + ||\beta Qf||^2 \leq \max\{||\alpha||_\infty, ||\beta||_\infty\}\big(||Pf||^2 + ||Qf||^2\big) = \max\{||\alpha||_\infty, ||\beta||_\infty\}||f||^2.$$

Therefore $||S_{\alpha,\beta}|| \leq \max\{||\alpha||_\infty, ||\beta||_\infty\}$ and hence, by (ii), $||S_{\alpha,\beta}|| = \max\{||\alpha||_\infty, ||\beta||_\infty\}$.

(iv) In view of (ii), it is enough to show that for some $f \in L^2$, $||S_{\alpha,\beta}f||^2 = (||\alpha||_\infty^2 + ||\beta||_\infty^2)||f||^2$. By the given condition it follows that there is an L^2 function f such that $\alpha Pf - \beta Qf = 0$. Since $|\alpha| = |\beta| =$ constant,

$$\big(||\alpha||_\infty^2 + ||\beta||_\infty^2\big)\, ||f||^2 - ||S_{\alpha,\beta}f||^2 = ||\alpha Pf - \beta Qf||^2 = 0.$$

(v) For each $c \in [0,1]$, define $\beta_c(z) = cz + (1-c)\bar{z}$. Note that $c \to \beta_c$ is continuous from $[0,1]$ into L^∞. Therefore, by (i), $c \to ||S_{1,\beta_c}||$ is continuous. Now, by (iii), $||S_{1,\beta_0}|| = 1$, and by (iv), $||S_{1,\beta_1}|| = \sqrt{2}$. Therefore there exists $a \in (0,1)$ such that $||S_{1,\beta_a}||$ is strictly in between 1 and $\sqrt{2}$. But note that, for any $c \in [0,1]$, $\max\{||1||, ||\beta_c||_\infty\} = 1$ and $\sqrt{||1||_\infty + ||\beta_c||_\infty} = \sqrt{2}$. In particular, we conclude that

$$\max\big\{||1||_\infty, ||\beta_a||_\infty\big\} < ||S_{1,\beta_a}|| < \sqrt{||1||_\infty^2 + ||\beta_a||_\infty^2}.$$

□

4. COMMUTATORS

This section deals with the commutators of the operator $S_{z,\bar{z}}$. It is easy to check that $S_{z,\bar{z}}^* S_{z,\bar{z}} = I$. So the operator $S_{z,\bar{z}}$ is an isometry.

Definition 4.1. A function in L^2 is said to be analytic if it is in H^2, and it is said to be co-analytic if its conjugate is analytic.

Proposition 4.2. *$S_{\alpha,\beta}$ commutes with $S_{z,\bar{z}}$ iff α is analytic and β is co-analytic.*

Proof. Let α be analytic and β be co-analytic. $S_{z,\bar{z}}S_{\alpha,\beta}f = S_{z,\bar{z}}(\alpha Pf + \beta Qf) = z\alpha Pf + \bar{z}\beta Qf$. On the other hand $S_{\alpha,\beta}S_{z,\bar{z}}f = S_{\alpha,\beta}(zPf + \bar{z}Qf) = \alpha zPf + \bar{z}\beta Qf$. Therefore $S_{z,\bar{z}}S_{\alpha,\beta} = S_{\alpha,\beta}S_{z,\bar{z}}$. Conversely, let $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ commutes with $S_{z,\bar{z}}$. Then $S_{z,\bar{z}}S_{\alpha,\beta}1 = S_{\alpha,\beta}S_{z,\bar{z}}1$ which gives $zP\alpha + \bar{z}Q\alpha = z\alpha = zP\alpha + zQ\alpha$ so that $\bar{z}Q\alpha = zQ\alpha$ or $Q\alpha = 0$ or α is analytic. Again $S_{z,\bar{z}}S_{\alpha,\beta}\bar{z} = S_{\alpha,\beta}S_{z,\bar{z}}\bar{z}$ which gives $zP(\beta\bar{z}) + \bar{z}Q(\beta\bar{z}) = \beta\bar{z}^2 = \bar{z}P(\beta\bar{z}) + \bar{z}Q(\beta\bar{z})$. Therefore we get $P(\beta\bar{z}) = 0$ or $\beta\bar{z} \in H^{2\perp}$ or β is co-analytic. □

Theorem 4.3. *Let T be a bounded operator on L^2. Then $T = S_{\alpha,\beta}$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in L^\infty$ with α analytic and β co-analytic iff the following two conditions hold :*
(i) *T commutes with $S_{z,\bar{z}}$,*
(ii) *$T\big(H^2 - \{0\}\big)$ intersects H^2 and $T\big(H^{2\perp} - \{0\}\big)$ intersects $H^{2\perp}$.*

Proof. For the only if part, (i) follows from the previous Proposition. (ii) is clear; in fact more is true that both H^2 and $H^{2\perp}$ are invariant under T. For the converse part we follow the usual method. Assume that T be a bounded operator satisfying conditions (i) and (ii). First note that $S^n_{z,\bar{z}}1 = z^n$ and $S^n_{z,\bar{z}}\bar{z} = \bar{z}^{n+1}$, $n \geq 0$. Therefore, defining the L^2 functions $\alpha := T1$, $\beta := zT\bar{z}$ and using the fact that T commutes with $S_{z,\bar{z}}$, we get

$$Tz^n = TS^n_{z,\bar{z}}1 = S^n_{z,\bar{z}}T1 = S^n_{z,\bar{z}}\alpha,$$

$$T\bar{z}^{n+1} = TS^n_{z,\bar{z}}\bar{z} = S^n_{z,\bar{z}}T\bar{z} = S^n_{z,\bar{z}}(\bar{z}\beta), \quad n \geq 0.$$

But, it is easy to check that, for any f, $S^n_{z,\bar{z}}f = z^nPf + \bar{z}^nQf$. Using this in the above we get

$$Tz^n = z^nP\alpha + \bar{z}^nQ\alpha,$$

$$T\bar{z}^{n+1} = z^nP(\bar{z}\beta) + \bar{z}^nQ(\bar{z}\beta), \quad n \geq 0.$$

Define $\tilde{f}(z) = f(\bar{z})$. Then the above two equations are clearly equivalent to saying that

$$Tf = fP\alpha + \tilde{f}Q\alpha, \quad \text{for all trigonometric polynomial } f \in H^2, \tag{4.1}$$

$$Tf = \widetilde{zf}P(\bar{z}\beta) + zfQ(\bar{z}\beta), \quad \text{for all trigonometric polynomial } f \in H^{2\perp}. \tag{4.2}$$

Now using the boundedness of T we shall show that 4.1 is true for all f in H^2 and 4.2 is true for all f in $H^{2\perp}$. Let $f \in H^2$. Then there is a sequence of analytic trigonometric polynomials f_n such that $f_n \to f$ in L^2. By 4.1, $Tf_n = f_nP\alpha + \tilde{f}_nQ\alpha$. Now, along a subsequence $f_{n_k} \to f$ point wise almost everywhere. Therefore $\big(f_{n_k}P\alpha + \tilde{f}_{n_k}Q\alpha\big) \to (fP\alpha + \tilde{f}Q\alpha)$ point wise almost everywhere. But T being bounded $Tf_n \to Tf$ in L^2. So we conclude that $Tf = fP\alpha + \tilde{f}Q\alpha$ almost everywhere. In a similar way we can prove that 4.2 is true for f in $H^{2\perp}$. So we got

$$Tf = fP\alpha + \tilde{f}Q\alpha, \quad \text{for all } \ f \in H^2, \tag{4.3}$$

$$Tf = \widetilde{zf}P(\bar{z}\beta) + zfQ(\bar{z}\beta), \quad \text{for all } f \in H^{2\perp}. \tag{4.4}$$

Now, by condition (ii), there is a non zero function f_0 in H^2 such that $Tf_0 \in H^2$. Therefore for $f = f_0$ equation (4.3) implies that $\tilde{f}_0Q\alpha = 0$ or $Q\alpha = 0$ or α is analytic. In a similar way, using the fact $T\big(H^{2\perp} - \{0\}\big)$ intersects $H^{2\perp}$ in equation (4.4), we get $P(\bar{z}\beta) = 0$ or $\bar{z}\beta \in H^{2\perp}$ or β is co-analytic. Therefore (4.3) gives $Tf = \alpha f$ if $f \in H^2$; and 4.4 gives $Tf = \beta f$ if $f \in H^{2\perp}$. So, we can write $Tf = \alpha Pf + \beta Qf$ for all $f \in L^2$. Hence $T = S_{\alpha,\beta}$. It remains to prove that $\alpha, \beta \in L^\infty$. The proof of these facts are exactly similar to that for a Toeplitz operators. But for the shake of completeness we present the proof of $\beta \in L^\infty$. The proof that $\alpha \in L^\infty$ will be similar. If T is zero operator the result is trivial. So assume that $T \neq 0$. Define $\gamma = \frac{\beta}{||T||}$. Since $\beta \in L^2$ so is $\gamma\theta$. If $f \in H^{2\perp}$, $Tf = \beta f$ and hence $||\beta f|| = ||Tf|| \leq ||T||||f||$. Therefore $||\gamma f|| \leq ||f||$. Putting $f = \bar{z}$ we get $||\gamma|| = ||\gamma\bar{z}|| \leq 1$. Again $||\gamma^2|| = ||\gamma^2\bar{z}|| = ||\gamma(\gamma\bar{z})|| \leq ||\gamma\bar{z}|| \leq 1$. Using induction we can prove that $||\gamma^n|| \leq 1$ for all positive integers n. Now we claim that $||\gamma||_\infty \leq 1$. If not there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that the set

$$E := \{e^{i\theta} : |\gamma(e^{i\theta})| \geq 1 + \epsilon\}$$

has positive measure. But then one can easily show that $||\gamma^n|| \geq (1+\epsilon)^n|E|$, where $|E|$ denotes the measure of E. Since $||\gamma^n|| \leq 1$ for all n, $|E|$ must be zero which is a contradiction. Therefore our claim that $||\gamma||_\infty \leq 1$ is true, and consequently β is in L^∞. ☐

Remark 4.4. We want to remark that for the if part in the previous theorem we need the condition (ii). It is possible to get an bounded operator T which commutes with $S_{z,\bar{z}}$ but T can not be written in the form $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ for any $\alpha, \beta \in L^\infty$. Here we provide one such example. Define T on the orthonormal basis as : $Tz^n = z^n + \bar{z}^{n+1}$ if $n \geq 0$ and $Tz^n = 0$ if n is negative. Extend T by linearity to the space of all trigonometric polynomials. It is not hard to see that, for a trigonometric polynomial f, $Tf = Pf + \bar{z}\widetilde{Pf}$, so that $||Tf|| \leq ||Pf|| + ||\bar{z}\widetilde{Pf}|| \leq 2||f||$, since $||\widetilde{Pf}|| = ||Pf||$. therefore we can extend T as a bounded operator on L^2. We continue to call this extended bounded operator as T. Now we show that T commutes with $S_{z,\bar{z}}$. It is enough to show this only on the orthonormal basis $\{z^n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, where $\mathbb{Z}$ denotes the set of all integers. If $n \geq 0$, then $TS_{z,\bar{z}}z^n = Tz^{n+1} = z^{n+1} + \bar{z}^{n+2} = S_{z,\bar{z}}(z^n + \bar{z}^{n+1}) = S_{z,\bar{z}}Tz^n$. On the other hand if n is negative both $TS_{z,\bar{z}}z^n$ and $S_{z,\bar{z}}Tz^n$ are zero.

Form the above remark we have seen that only the condition that T commutes with $S_{z,\bar{z}}$ does not imply that T is of the form $S_{\alpha,\beta}$. But if we increase the set of commutators a little more it is possible to get the desired result with out imposing the condition (ii). In fact the condition (ii) will hold automatically in that case.

Theorem 4.5. *A bounded operator T commutes with both $S_{z,0}$ and $S_{0,\bar{z}}$ iff $T = S_{\alpha,\beta}$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in L^\infty$ where α is analytic and β is co-analytic.*

Proof. If $\alpha, \beta \in L^\infty$ with α analytic and β co-analytic then $S_{z,0}S_{\alpha,\beta}f = z\alpha Pf$ and $S_{\alpha,\beta}S_{z,0}f = \alpha zPf$ for all f in L^2 so that $S_{z,0}T = TS_{z,0}$. Similarly we can show that $T = S_{\alpha,\beta}$ commutes with $S_{0,\bar{z}}$. Conversely, let T commutes with both $S_{z,0}$ and $S_{0,\bar{z}}$. In view of the previous theorem it is enough to show that T satisfies the conditions (i) and (ii) there. Since $S_{z,\bar{z}} = S_{z,0} + S_{0,\bar{z}}$, clearly T commutes with $S_{z,\bar{z}}$ and thus satisfies condition (i). Now $S_{0,\bar{z}}T1 = TS_{0,\bar{z}}1$ gives $\bar{z}Q(T1) = 0$ or $Q(T1) = 0$ or $T1 \in H^2$. Again, $S_{z,0}T\bar{z} = TS_{z,0}\bar{z}$ gives $zP(T\bar{z}) = 0$ or $P(T\bar{z}) = 0$ or $T\bar{z}$ is in $H^{2,\perp}$. Hence T satisfies condition (ii) and we are done. ☐

5. INVARIANT SUSPACES

In this section we give description of invariant subspaces and reducings subspace of $S_{z,\bar{z}}$.

Theorem 5.1. *$M \subset L^2$ is an invariant subspace of $S_{z,\bar{z}}$ iff there exist inner functions ϕ and ψ such that $M = \phi H^2 \oplus \bar{\psi}H^{2\perp}$.*

Proof. Let M be an invariant subspace of $S_{z,\bar{z}}$. Write $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$, where $M_1 \subset H^2$ and $M_2 \subset H^{2\perp}$. Note that $S_{z,\bar{z}}M = zM_1 \oplus \bar{z}M_2$ which is contained in $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$. Therefore $zM_1 \subset M_1$ and $\bar{z}M_2 \subset M_2$ or equivalently both M_1 and $\bar{z}\bar{M}_2$ are forward shift invariant subspace of H^2. Therefore, by Beurling‘s Theorem there exists inner functions ϕ and ψ such that $M_1 = \phi H^2$ and $\bar{z}\bar{M}_2 = \psi H^2$ or $M_2 = \bar{\psi}\bar{z}\bar{H}^2 = \bar{\psi}H^{2\perp}$. Conversely, let ϕ and ψ be two inner functions. By Beurling‘s theorem ϕH^2 is invariant under the forward shift. Since ϕH^2 is a subspace of H^2 and $S_{z,\bar{z}} \mid_{H^2}$ is nothing but the forward shift on H^2, we can say that ϕH^2 is invariant under $S_{z,\bar{z}}$. Again, ψz being an inner function, by Beurling‘s Theorem $\psi z H^2$ is an invariant subspace under forward shift. Equivalently $\bar{\psi}H^{2\perp} = \bar{\psi}\overline{zH^2}$ is invariant under multiplication by $\bar{z}$. Hence $\bar{\psi}H^{2\perp}$ is invariant under $S_{z,\bar{z}}$. Therefore $\phi H^2 \oplus \bar{\psi}H^{2\perp}$ is an invariant subspace of $S_{z,\bar{z}}$. □

Theorem 5.2. *$M \subset L^2$ is a reducing subspace of $S_{z,\bar{z}}$ iff M is L^2 or $\{0\}$ or H^2 or $H^{2\perp}$.*

Proof. The sufficient part is easy to see. For the necessary part, let M is a reducing subspace of $S_{z,\bar{z}}$. Write $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$, where M_1 and M_2 are subspaces of H_2 and $H^{2\perp}$ respectively. Since M is invariant under $S_{z,\bar{z}}$, by the proof of the previous theorem, both M_1 and $\bar{z}\bar{M}_2$ are forward shift invariant subspaces of H^2. Again, we have $S^*_{z,\bar{z}}M \subset M_1 \oplus M_2$ or $P(\bar{z}M) + Q(zM) \subset M_1 \oplus M_2$ so that $P(\bar{z}M) \subset M_1$ and $Q(zM) \subset M_2$. But $P(\bar{z}M) = P(\bar{z}M_1)$ and $Q(zM) = Q(zM_2)$. Therefore M_1 is an invariant subspace under the adjoint of forward shift (on H^2) . Thus it is a reducing subspace of forward shift (on H^2) and hence it must be equal to H^2 or $\{0\}$. On the other hand, since $Q(zM_2) \subset M_2$, one can show that $P(\bar{z}\bar{z}\bar{M}_2) \subset \bar{z}\bar{M}_2$. In fact, if $f \in \bar{M}_2$ then $\bar{f} \in M_2$ so that $Q(z\bar{f}) \in M_2$ or $z\big(\bar{f} - \hat{\bar{f}}(-1)\bar{z}\big) \in M_2$ or $\big(\bar{f} - \hat{\bar{f}}(-1)\bar{z}\big) \in \bar{z}M_2$ or $\big(f - \bar{\hat{\bar{f}}}(-1)z\big) \in z\bar{M}_2$ or $\bar{z}^2 f - \bar{\hat{\bar{f}}}(-1)\bar{z} \in \bar{z}\bar{M}_2$ or $\bar{z}^2 f - \hat{f}(1)\bar{z} \in \bar{z}\bar{M}_2$ which implies $P(\bar{z}^2 f) \subset \bar{z}M_2$ as desired. Therefore, $\bar{z}\bar{M}_2$ is also a reducing subspace of the forward shift operator on H^2 and hence $\bar{z}\bar{M}_2 = H^2$ or $\{0\}$ or equivalently $M_2 = \bar{z}\overline{H^2} = H^{2\perp}$ or $\{0\}$. But we already had that $M_1 = H^2$ or $\{0\}$. So we conclude that M is L^2 or $\{0\}$ or H^2 or $H^{2\perp}$. □

6. COMPOSITION OF TWO OPERATORS

This section deals with composition of two operators of the form S_{α_1,β_1} and S_{α_2,β_2}. We shall show that when such a composition is again of the form $S_{\alpha,\beta}$. We also study their commutativity.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $\alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2 \in L^\infty$. Then $S_{\alpha_1,\beta_1}S_{\alpha_2,\beta_2} = S_{\alpha,\beta}$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in L^\infty$ iff either $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$, or α_2 is analytic and β_2 is co-analytic. In that case $\alpha = \alpha_1\alpha_2$ and $\beta = \beta_1\beta_2$.*

Proof. For $f \in L^2$,

$$S_{\alpha_1,\beta_1}S_{\alpha_2,\beta_2}f = \alpha_1 P(\alpha_2 Pf + \beta_2 Qf) + \beta_1 Q(\alpha_2 Pf + \beta_2 Qf).$$

If $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$, then right hand side becomes $\alpha_1\alpha_2 Pf + \beta_1\beta_2 Qf$ which is nothing but $S_{\alpha_1\alpha_2,\beta_1\beta_2}f$. If α_2 is analytic and β_2 is co-analytic, then too, the right hand side equals to $\alpha_1\alpha_2 Pf + \beta_1\beta_2 Qf = S_{\alpha_1\alpha_2,\beta_1\beta_2}$. This proves the if part of the Theorem. For the converse part, let $S_{\alpha_1,\beta_1}S_{\alpha_2,\beta_2} = S_{\alpha,\beta}$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in L^\infty$. Applying on z^n to both sides, we get

$$\alpha_1 P(\alpha_2 z^n) + \beta_1 Q(\alpha_2 z^n) = \alpha z^n, n \geq 0, \tag{6.1}$$

$$\alpha_1 P(\beta_2 z^n) + \beta_1 Q(\beta_2 z^n) = \beta z^n, n \leq -1, \tag{6.2}$$

Writing $P(\alpha_2 z^n) = \alpha_2 z^n - Q(\alpha_2 z^n)$ in 6.1, it follows that

$$(\alpha - \alpha_1\alpha_2)z^n = (\beta_1 - \alpha_1)Q(\alpha_2 z^n), n \geq 0.$$

Taking L_2 norm of both side we get

$$||\alpha-\alpha_1\alpha_2|| = ||(\beta_1-\alpha_1)Q(\alpha_2 z^n)|| \leq ||\beta_1-\alpha_1||_\infty ||Q(\alpha_2 z^n)||, n \geq 0.$$

Since $||Q(\alpha_2 z^n)|| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, we conclude that $\alpha = \alpha_1\alpha_2$. In a similar way, using 6.2, we can show that $\beta = \beta_1\beta_2$. Therefore 6.1 with $n = 0$ and 6.2 with $n = -1$ respectively give $\alpha_1 P(\alpha_2)+\beta_1 Q(\alpha_2) = \alpha_1\alpha_2$ and $\alpha_1 P(\beta_2\bar{z})+\beta_1 Q(\beta_2\bar{z}) = \beta_1\beta_2\bar{z}$. Writing $P(\alpha_2) = \alpha_2 - Q(\alpha_2)$ and $Q(\beta_2\bar{z}) = \beta_2\bar{z} - P(\beta_2\bar{z})$, it follows that $(\beta_1-\alpha_1)Q(\alpha_2) = 0$ and $(\alpha_1-\beta_1)P(\beta_2\bar{z}) = 0$. Since a non zero analytic or co-analytic function can not vanishes on a set of positive measure, either $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$ or α_2 analytic and β_2 co-analytic. □

Corollary 6.2. *Let $\alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2 \in L^\infty$. Then $S_{\alpha_1,\beta_1}S_{\alpha_2,\beta_2} = 0$ iff at least one of the following holds.*
(i) $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$, $\alpha_1\alpha_2 = \beta_1\beta_2 = 0$,
(ii) $\alpha_1 = \beta_2 = 0$, α_2 is analytic.
(iii) $\alpha_2 = \beta_1 = 0$, β_2 is co-analytic.
(iv) $\alpha_2 = \beta_2 = 0$.

Proof. If part is easy to see from the formula of $S_{\alpha_1,\beta_1}S_{\alpha_2,\beta_2}f$:

$$S_{\alpha_1,\beta_1}S_{\alpha_2,\beta_2}f = \alpha_1 P(\alpha_2 Pf + \beta_2 Qf) + \beta_1 Q(\alpha_2 Pf + \beta_2 Qf).$$

Conversely, let $S_{\alpha_1,\beta_1}S_{\alpha_2,\beta_2} = 0 = S_{0,0}$.
Case-1 : $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$. Then $S_{\alpha_1\alpha_2,\beta_1\beta_2} = S_{\alpha_1,\beta_1}S_{\alpha_2,\beta_2} = 0$ and hence $\alpha_1\alpha_2 = \beta_1\beta_2 = 0$.
Case-2 : $\alpha_1 \neq \beta_1$. Then by the previous theorem, α_2 is analytic and β_2 is co-analytic. Also, $\alpha_1\alpha_2 = 0$ and $\beta_1\beta_2 = 0$. Since a non zero analytic (or co-analytic) function can not be zero on a set of positive measure, it follows that at least one of α_1 and α_2 is zero and at least one of β_1 and β_2 is zero. Since we are dealing with the case $\alpha_1 \neq \beta_1$, at least one of (ii), (iii) and (iv) must hold. □

Theorem 6.3. *Let $\alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2 \in L^\infty$. S_{α_1,β_1} commutes with S_{α_2,β_2} iff at least one of the following holds:*
(i) *α_1, α_2 analytic and β_1, β_2 co-analytic.*
(ii) *$\alpha_1 = \beta_1$ and $\alpha_2 = \beta_2$.*
(iii) *There are constants a, b, c with at least one of a and b is non-zero such that $a\alpha_1 + b\alpha_2 = a\beta_1 + b\beta_2 = c$.*

To prove the theorem, we need several lemmas.

Lemma 6.4. *Let $\alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2 \in L^\infty$. S_{α_1,β_1} commutes with S_{α_2,β_2} iff following two holds:*

$$(\alpha_1-\beta_1)Q(\alpha_2 f) = (\alpha_2-\beta_2)Q(\alpha_1 f) \quad \text{for all } f \in H^2, \tag{6.3}$$

$$(\alpha_1-\beta_1)P(\beta_2 g) = (\alpha_2-\beta_2)P(\beta_1 g) \quad \text{for all } g \in H^{2\perp}. \tag{6.4}$$

Proof. S_{α_1,β_1} commutes with S_{α_2,β_2} iff $S_{\alpha_1,\beta_1}S_{\alpha_2,\beta_2}f = S_{\alpha_2,\beta_2}S_{\alpha_1,\beta_1 f}$ for all f in H^2 and $S_{\alpha_1,\beta_1}S_{\alpha_2,\beta_2}g = S_{\alpha_2,\beta_2}S_{\alpha_1,\beta_1}g$ for all g in $H^{2\perp}$. Now, for $f \in H^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\alpha_1,\beta_1}S_{\alpha_2,\beta_2}f = S_{\alpha_2,\beta_2}S_{\alpha_1,\beta_1 f} \quad &\iff \quad S_{\alpha_1,\beta_1}(\alpha_2 f) = S_{\alpha_2,\beta_2}(\alpha_1 f) \\ &\iff \quad \alpha_1 P(\alpha_2 f) + \beta_1 Q(\alpha_2 f) = \alpha_2 P(\alpha_1 f) + \beta_2 Q(\alpha_1 f) \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to (6.3) since $\alpha_1 P(\alpha_2 f) = \alpha_1\alpha_2 f - \alpha_1 Q(\alpha_2 f)$ and $\alpha_2 P(\alpha_1 f) = \alpha_1\alpha_2 f - \alpha_2 Q(\alpha_1 f)$. In a similar way we can show that, for g in $H^{2\perp}$, $S_{\alpha_1,\beta_1}S_{\alpha_2,\beta_2}g = S_{\alpha_2,\beta_2}S_{\alpha_1,\beta_1}g$ is equivalent to (6.4). Hence the proof. ☐

Lemma 6.5. *Let $\phi_1, \psi_1, \phi_2, \psi_2 \in L^\infty$. Then $\psi_1 Q(\phi_2 f) = \psi_2 Q(\phi_1 f)$ for all f in H^2 iff at least one of the following holds :*
(a) *Both ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are analytic.*
(b) $\psi_1 = \psi_2 = 0$.
(c) *There are constants a and b with at least one of them is non-zero such that $a\psi_1 + b\psi_2 = 0$ and $aQ(\phi_1) + bQ(\phi_2) = 0$.*

Proof. In this proof, without further mentioning, we use the fact that a non zero analytic function can not vanish on a set of positive measure. It is obvious that any one of conditions (a) and (b) is sufficient, where as sufficiency of condition (c) follows from the fact that $Q(\phi_1) = cQ(\phi_2)$ implies $Q(\phi_1 f) = cQ(\phi_2 f)$ for all f in H^2. For the necessary part, it is enough to prove that, if atleast one of ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 is not analytic then (b) or (c) holds. Here we prove this assuming that ϕ_2 is not analytic. The proof when ϕ_1 is not analytic will be similar. Two cases may happen : $\psi_1\psi_2 = 0$ and $\psi_1\psi_2 \neq 0$. Assume that $\psi_1\psi_2 = 0$. The given equation with $f = 1$ gives $\psi_1 Q(\phi_2) = \psi_2 Q(\phi_1)$. Multipling both sides with ψ_1 we get $\psi_1^2 Q(\phi_2) = \psi_1\psi_2 Q(\phi_1)$ which implies $\psi_1^2 = 0$ or $\psi_1 = 0$. Similarly, multiplying both sides by ψ_2, we get $\psi_2 = 0$. So the first case implies condition (b). Now we consider the second case i.e. ϕ_2 is not analytic and $\psi_1\psi_2 \neq 0$. For any f, g in H^2, we have $\psi_1 Q(\phi_2 f) = \psi_2 Q(\phi_1 f)$ and $\psi_1 Q(\phi_2 g) = \psi_2 Q(\phi_1 g)$. Cross multipliying these two equation we get

$$\psi_1\psi_2 Q(\phi_2 f)Q(\phi_1 g) = \psi_1\psi_2 Q(\phi_1 f)Q(\phi_2 g)$$

or

$$Q(\phi_2 f)Q(\phi_1 g) = Q(\phi_1 f)Q(\phi_2 g) \quad \text{for all } f, g \in H^2. \tag{6.5}$$

Since ϕ_2 is not analytic there exist integer $n_0 \geq 1$ such that $\hat{\phi}_2(-n_0) \neq 0$. In 6.5, putting $f = z^{n_0-1}$ and $g = z^n$ ($n \geq 0$), we get $Q(\phi_2 z^{n_0-1})Q(\phi_1 z^n) = Q(\phi_1 z^{n_0-1})Q(\phi_2 z^n)$. Now we compare the coefficients of z^{-2} from both sides. Coefficient of z^{-2} in the series of $Q(\phi_2 z^{n_0-1})Q(\phi_1 z^n)$ is equal to the multiplication of the coefficient of z^{-1} in the series of $Q(\phi_2 z^{n_0-1})$ and the same in the series of $Q(\phi_1 z^n)$ which is nothing but $\hat{\phi}_2(-n_0)\hat{\phi}_1(-n-1)$. Similarly, the coefficient of z^{-2} in the series of $Q(\phi_1 z^{n_0-1})Q(\phi_2 z^n)$ is $\hat{\phi}_1(-n_0)\hat{\phi}_2(-n-1)$. So, we get $\hat{\phi}_2(-n_0)\hat{\phi}_1(-n-1) = \hat{\phi}_1(-n_0)\hat{\phi}_2(-n-1)$ or $\hat{\phi}_1(-n-1) = \frac{\hat{\phi}_1(-n_0)}{\hat{\phi}_2(-n_0)}\hat{\phi}_2(-n-1)$ for all $n \geq 0$. But this is equivalent to saying that $Q(\phi_1) = cQ(\phi_2)$, where $c = \frac{\hat{\phi}_1(-n_0)}{\hat{\phi}_2(-n_0)}$. Therefore the given equation with $f = 1$ gives $\psi_1 = c\psi_2$ and hence condition (c) follows. ☐

In a similar way we can prove the following lemma.

Lemma 6.6. *Let $\phi_1, \psi_1, \phi_2, \psi_2 \in L^\infty$. Then $\psi_1 P(\phi_2 g) = \psi_2 P(\phi_1 g)$ for all g in $H^{2\perp}$ iff at least one of the following holds :*
(a) *Both ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are co-analytic.*
(b) $\psi_1 = \psi_2 = 0$.

(c) *There are constants* a *and* b *with at least one of them non zero such that* $a\psi_1 + b\psi_2 = 0$ *and* $aP(\bar{z}\phi_1) + bP(\bar{z}\phi_2) = 0$.

Proof of Theorem 6.3 : For the sufficient part we need to show that any one condition of (i), (ii) and (iii) implies equations (6.3) and (6.4) in Lemma 6.4. That this is true for condition (i) or (ii) is obvious. On the other hand, condition (iii) implies that $a(\alpha_1 - \beta_1) = -b(\alpha_2 - \beta_2)$, $aQ(\alpha_1) = -bQ(\alpha_2)$ and $aP(\bar{z}\beta_1) = -bP(\bar{z}\beta_2)$. But $aQ(\alpha_1) = -bQ(\alpha_2)$ is equivalent to saying that $aQ(\alpha_1 f) = -bQ(\alpha_2 f)$ for all $f \in H^2$, where as $aP(\bar{z}\beta_1) = -bP(\bar{z}\beta_2)$ is equivalent to saying that $aP(\beta_1 g) = -bP(\beta_2 g)$ for all $g \in H^{2\perp}$. Hence equations (6.3) and (6.4) follows. So the sufficient part is proved.

Now we prove the necessary part. So let S_{α_1,β_1} commutes with S_{α_2,β_2}. By Lemma 6.4, equations (6.3) and (6.4) are true. But, equation (6.3), by Lemma 6.5, implies that at least one of the following holds :
(1) Both α_1 and α_2 are analytic
(2) $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$ and $\alpha_2 = \beta_2$
(3) There are constants a' and b' with at least one of them non zero such that $a'(\alpha_1 - \beta_1) + b'(\alpha_2 - \beta_2) = 0$ and $a'Q(\alpha_1) + b'Q(\alpha_2) = 0$.
Again, 6.4, by Lemma 6.6, implies that at lest one of the following holds :
($1'$) Both β_1 and β_2 are co-analytic
($2'$) $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$ and $\alpha_2 = \beta_2$
($3'$) There are constants a'' and b'' with at least one of them non zero such that $a''(\alpha_1 - \beta_1) + b''(\alpha_2 - \beta_2) = 0$ and $a''P(\bar{z}\beta_1) + b''P(\bar{z}\beta_2) = 0$.

Since (2) or ($2'$) implies (ii), we only need to consider the following four cases.

Case-1 : (1) and ($1'$) are true. But this is nothing but condition (i).

Case-2 : (1) and ($3'$) are true. ($3'$) implies that $a''\alpha_1 + b''\alpha_2 = a''\beta_1 + b''\beta_2$. Since, by (1), α_1 and α_2 are analytic, $a''\beta_1 + b''\beta_2$ is analytic so that all of its negative Fourier coefficients are zero. But, all of its (strictly) positive Fourier coefficients are zero too since, by ($3'$), $P\big(\bar{z}(a''\beta_1 + b''\beta_2)\big) = 0$. Therefore $a''\beta_1 + b''\beta_2$ is nothing but a constant. So we get (iii) in this case.

Case-3 : (3) and ($1'$) are true. This implies (iii). Proof is similar to the previous case.

Case-4 : (3) and ($3'$) are true. We can assume that $\alpha_1 \neq \beta_1$ or $\alpha_2 \neq \beta_2$, because otherwise it will give (ii). So, without loss of generality assume that $\alpha_1 \neq \beta_1$. This will force both b' and b'' to be non zero and $a'/b' = a''/b''(= d$ say). So, we have $d\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = d\beta_1 + \beta_2$, $Q(d\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) = 0$ and $P\big(\bar{z}(d\beta_1 + \beta_2)\big) = 0$. Therefore $P\big(\bar{z}(d\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)\big) = 0$. But, then $d\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ must be a constant and hence, this case implies (iii).

7. COMPACTNESS

In this section we shall discuss about the compactness of the operator $S_{\alpha,\beta}$. The following theorem says that there are no non trivial compact operators $S_{\alpha,\beta}$.

Theorem 7.1. *If* $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ *is compact then* $\alpha = \beta = 0$.

Proof. Let $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ is compact. Note that $S_{\alpha,\beta} z^n = \alpha z^n$ for all $n \geq 0$, so that $||S_{\alpha,\beta} z^n|| = ||\alpha||$ if $n \geq 0$. Since $1, z, z^2 \cdots$ is a sequence of orthonormal elements, $||S_{\alpha,\beta} z^n|| \to 0$ as $n \to 0$.

Therefore $||\alpha|| = 0$ or $\alpha = 0$. In a similar way, taking the sequence $\bar{z}, \bar{z}^2, \bar{z}^3 \cdots$, we can show that $\beta = 0$. ☐

Compact operators can not even go closer to $S_{\alpha,\beta}$.

Theorem 7.2. *Let $\alpha, \beta \in L^\infty$, and K be a compact operator on L^2. Then $||S_{\alpha,\beta} - K|| \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}||S_{\alpha,\beta}||$. The constant $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, appeared in the inequality, is the maximum one.*

Proof. Let n be a non-negative integer. Since the operator $S_{z^n,\bar{z}^n}$ sends z^k to z^{k+n} and $\bar{z}^{k+1}$ to $\bar{z}^{k+1+n}$ for $k \geq 0$, it follows that $S_{z^n,\bar{z}^n}$ is an isometry so that $||S^*_{z^n,\bar{z}^n}|| = ||S_{z^n,\bar{z}^n}|| = 1$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
||S_{\alpha,\beta} - K|| &= ||S^*_{\alpha,\beta} - K^*|| \\
&\geq ||S^*_{z^n,\bar{z}^n}(S^*_{\alpha,\beta} - K^*)|| \\
&= ||(S_{\alpha,\beta}S_{z^n\bar{z}^n})^* - S^*_{z^n,\bar{z}^n}K^*|| \\
&= ||S^*_{\alpha z^n,\beta\bar{z}^n} - S^*_{z^n,\bar{z}^n}K^*|| \quad \text{by Theorem 6.1} \\
&\geq ||S^*_{\alpha z^n,\beta\bar{z}^n}|| - ||S^*_{z^n,\bar{z}^n}K^*|| \\
&= ||S_{\alpha z^n,\beta\bar{z}^n}|| - ||S^*_{z^n,\bar{z}^n}K^*||.
\end{aligned}$$

Now by Theorem 3.1 (ii),

$$||S_{\alpha z^n\beta\bar{z}^n}|| \geq \max\{||\alpha||_\infty, ||\beta||_\infty\} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sqrt{||\alpha||^2_\infty + ||\beta||^2_\infty} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}||S_{\alpha,\beta}||.$$

Again, for any f in L^2, $S^*_{z^n,\bar{z}^n}f = P(\bar{z}^n f) + Q(z^n f)$ which goes to 0 as $n \to \infty$. But K being compact so is K^*. Therefore $||S^*_{z^n,\bar{z}^n}K^*|| \to 0$. So we conclude the first part of the Theorem.

For the second part it is enough to show that there are L^∞ functions α, β and a compact operator K such that $||S_{\alpha,\beta} - K|| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}||S_{\alpha,\beta}||$. Take $\alpha = \bar{z}$, $\beta = 1$ and the finite rank operator (in particular compact) K on L^2 defined by $Kf = \hat{f}(0)\bar{z}$. Then, it is easy to see that

$$(S_{\bar{z},1} - K)f = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \hat{f}(n)z^{n-1} + \sum_{n=-1}^{-\infty} \hat{f}(n)z^n$$

so that

$$||(S_{\bar{z},1} - K)f||^2 = \sum_{n\neq 0} |\hat{f}(n)|^2 \leq ||f||^2.$$

Again $||(S_{\bar{z},1} - K)z|| = 1 = ||z||$. Therefore $||(S_{\bar{z},1} - K)|| = 1$. On the other hand, by Theorem 3.1 (iv), $||S_{\bar{z},1}|| = \sqrt{2}$. Hence $||S_{\bar{z},1} - K|| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}||S_{\bar{z},1}||$ as desired. ☐

8. SPECTRUM

In this section we discuss about the spectrum of the operator $S_{\alpha,\beta}$.

We can write

$$S_{\alpha,\beta} = S_{\alpha,0} + S_{0,\beta}.$$

It is easy to check that

$$S^*_{\alpha,0}f = P(\bar{\alpha}f); \quad S^*_{0,\beta}f = Q(\bar{\beta}f),$$

so that

$$S^*_{\alpha,\beta}f = P(\bar{\alpha}f) + Q(\bar{\beta}f).$$

For an operator T, we denote its point spectrum by $\Pi_0(T)$, approximate point spectrum by $\Pi(T)$ and spectrum by $\sigma(T)$. First we prove the following lemma which will be useful later in discussing the spectrum.

Lemma 8.1. *Let $\lambda \neq 0$. Then $(S^*_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I)f = g$ iff*

$$\begin{aligned} Qf &= -\frac{1}{\lambda}Qg, \\ (T_{\bar{\alpha}} - \lambda I)Pf &= Pg + \frac{1}{\lambda}P(\bar{\alpha}Qg). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $g \in H^2$ iff $f \in H^2$.

Proof. Let $(S^*_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I)f = g$. Writing $f = Pf + Qf$ and $g = Pg + Qg$ we get

$$P(\bar{\alpha}Pf) + P(\bar{\alpha}Qf) - \lambda Pf - \lambda Qf = Pg + Qg$$

Which gives

$$Qf = -\frac{1}{\lambda}Qg, \tag{8.1}$$

$$P(\bar{\alpha}Pf) - \lambda Pf = Pg - P(\bar{\alpha}Qf). \tag{8.2}$$

Using (8.1) in (8.2), we get

$$(T_{\bar{\alpha}} - \lambda I)Pf = Pg + \frac{1}{\lambda}P(\bar{\alpha}Qg).$$

Hence the necessary part of the lemma is proved. To prove the sufficient part, first note that, the given conditions clearly imply (8.1) and (8.2). Now, adding these two equations we get that $(S^*_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I)f = g$. □

Definition 8.2. For $\alpha \in L^\infty$, the *essential range* of α is defined to be

$$\text{ess ran } \alpha = \{\lambda : m\{e^{i\theta} : |\alpha(e^{i\theta}) - \lambda| < \epsilon\} > 0, \text{for all } \epsilon > 0\},$$

where m is the normalized Lebesgue measure.

The following theorem gives some descriptions about the spectrum for certain special cases.

Theorem 8.3. *Let $\alpha, \beta \in L^\infty$.*
(i) ess ran $\alpha \cup$ ess ran $\beta \subset \Pi(S_{\alpha,\beta})$
(ii) $\sigma(S_{\alpha,0}) = \sigma(T_\alpha) \cup \{0\}$ *and* $\sigma(S_{0,\beta}) = \sigma(\tilde{T}_\beta) \cup \{0\}$.
(iii) *If α is analytic or β is co-analytic, then $\sigma(S_{\alpha,\beta}) \subset \sigma(T_\alpha) \cup \sigma(\tilde{T}_\beta) \cup \{0\}$.*
(iv) If α is analytic and β is co-analytic, then $\sigma(S_{\alpha,\beta}) \cup \{0\} = \sigma(T_\alpha) \cup \sigma(\tilde{T}_\beta) \cup \{0\}$.

Proof. (i) Let M_α denotes the usual multiplication operator on L^2 given by $M_\alpha(f) = \alpha f$. Let $\lambda \in$ ess ran α. Then (see the proof of Theorem 3.3.1, page-108, [1]) there is a sequence of unit norm functions $h_n \in H^2$ such that $||(M_\alpha - \lambda)h_n|| \to 0$. But, note that, h_n being in H^2, $(M_\alpha - \lambda)h_n = (S_{\alpha,\beta} - \lambda)h_n$. Therefore $||(S_{\alpha,\beta} - \lambda)h_n|| \to 0$ proving that $\lambda \in \Pi(S_{\alpha,\beta})$. Hence ess ran $\alpha \subset \Pi(S_{\alpha,\beta})$. Now let $\lambda \in$ ess ran β. Looking at the same proof (i.e. proof of Theorem 3.3.1, page-108, [1]) it is not hard to see that there is an sequence of unit functions g_n in $H^{2\perp}$ such that $||(M_\beta - \lambda)g_n|| \to 0$. But, g_n being in $H^{2\perp}$, $(M_\beta - \lambda)g_n = (S_{\alpha,\beta} - \lambda)g_n$. It follows that $\lambda \in \Pi(S_{\alpha,\beta})$. Therefore ess ran $\beta \subset \Pi(S_{\alpha,\beta})$. This completes the proof of (i).

(ii) Clearly 0 is in the spectrum of $S_{\alpha,0}$. So, we have to prove that non zero spectrum of $S_{\alpha,0}$ is same as that of the Toeplitz operator T_α. Since spectrum of the adjoint of an operator is same as the conjugate of the spectrum of the operator, it is enough to show that non zero spectrum of $S^*_{\alpha 0}$ is same as that of $T^*_\alpha = T_{\bar{\alpha}}$. So take $\lambda \neq 0$. We have to show that $S^*_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I$ is invertible iff $T_{\bar{\alpha}} - \lambda I$ is invertible. First we note that $(S^*_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I)f = (T_{\bar{\alpha}} - \lambda I)f$ for all $f \in H^2$.

If $S^*_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I$ is injective then $(S^*_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I)f \neq 0$ for all non zero f in L^2 which implies that $(T_{\bar{\alpha}} - \lambda I)f \neq 0$ for all non zero f in H^2 and hence $T_{\bar{\alpha}} - \lambda I$ is injective.

If $S^*_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I$ is onto then for any $g \in H^2$ there is a $f \in L^2$ such that $(S^*_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I)f = g$. But then by Lemma 8.1, $f \in H^2$. Therefore $(T_{\bar{\alpha}} - \lambda I)f = g$. Hence $T_{\bar{\alpha}} - \lambda I$ is onto.

Let $T_{\bar{\alpha}} - \lambda I$ is injective. Then we shall show that $S^*_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I$ is also injective. Let $(S^*_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I)f = 0$. Then $P(\bar{\alpha} f) - \lambda f = 0$. Applying Q to both sides we have $Qf = 0$. Which implies that $f \in H^2$. As a result we have $(T_{\bar{\alpha}} - \lambda I)f = 0$ and which implies $f = 0$ proving the injectivity of $S^*_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I$.

Now assume that $T_{\bar{\alpha}} - \lambda I$ is onto. Let $g \in L^2$. There exist $h \in H^2$ such that

$$(T_{\bar{\alpha}} - \lambda I)h = Pg + \frac{1}{\lambda} P(\bar{\alpha} Q g).$$

Define $f \in L^2$ by $Qf = -\frac{1}{\lambda} Qg$ and $Pf = h$. Then, by Lemma 8.1, $(S^*_{\alpha,o} - \lambda I)f = g$ proving the ontoness of $S^*_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I$. This finishes the proof of the fact that $\sigma(S_{\alpha,0}) = \sigma(T_\alpha) \cup \{0\}$. The proof of $\sigma(S_{0,\beta}) = \sigma(\tilde{T}_\beta) \cup \{0\}$ is similar.

(iii) Let $\beta \in H^{2\perp}$. In view of (ii) it is enough to show that $\sigma(S_{\alpha,\beta}) \subset \sigma(S_{\alpha,0}) \cup \sigma(S_{0,\beta})$ which is again equivalent to showing that $\sigma(S^*_{\alpha,\beta}) \subset \sigma(S^*_{\alpha,0}) \cup \sigma(S^*_{0,\beta})$. Let $\lambda \neq 0$ be such that both $S^*_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I$ and $S^*_{0,\beta} - \lambda I$ are invertible. We need to show that $S^*_{\alpha,\beta} - \lambda I$ is invertible. If $(S^*_{\alpha,\beta} - \lambda)f = 0$, writing $f = Pf + Qf$, and then comparing the H^2, $H^{2\perp}$ components we get

$$P(\bar{\alpha} Pf) + P(\bar{\alpha} Qf) - \lambda Pf = 0, \tag{8.3}$$

$$Q(\bar{\beta} Pf) + Q(\bar{\beta} Qf) - \lambda Qf = 0.$$

Since β is co-analytic, the second equation gives $(S^*_{0,\beta} - \lambda I)Qf = 0$. But $(S^*_{0,\beta} - \lambda I)$ being injective, $Qf = 0$. Therefore (8.3) gives $(S^*_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I)Pf = 0$ which, by the injectivity of $S^*_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I$, implies that $Pf = 0$. Hence $f = 0$. Therefore $(S^*_{\alpha,\beta} - \lambda I)$ is injective. To prove its ontoness, let $g \in L^2$. Since $S^*_{0,\beta} - \lambda I$ is onto, there exists $h_1 \in L^2$ such that $(S^*_{0,\beta} - \lambda I)h_1 = Qg$. Applying the operator P, we get that $Ph_1 = 0$ or $h_1 \in H^{2\perp}$. Since $S^*_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I$ is onto, there exist $h_2 \in L^2$ such that $(S^*_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I)h_2 = Pg - P(\bar{\alpha} h_1)$. Applying Q to both side, we see that $Qh_2 = 0$ or $h_2 \in H^2$. Now define $f = h_1 + h_2$ so that $Qf = h_1$ and $Pf = h_2$. With this definition of f it is not hard to see that

$$P(\bar{\alpha} Pf) + P(\bar{\alpha} Qf) - \lambda Pf = Pg, \tag{8.4}$$

$$Q(\bar{\beta} Qf) - \lambda Qf = Qg.$$

Since β is co-analytic, the last equation is equivalent to

$$Q(\bar{\beta} Pf) + Q(\bar{\beta} Qf) - \lambda Qf = Qg. \tag{8.5}$$

Adding (8.4) and (8.5) we get $(S^*_{\alpha,\beta} - \lambda I)f = g$. Therefore $S^*_{\alpha,\beta} - \lambda I$ is onto. This completes the proof of (ii) when β is co-analytic. The proof for analytic α is similar.

(iv) In view of (i) and (ii), it is enough to show that $\sigma(S_{\alpha,0}) \cup \sigma(S_{0,\beta}) \subset \sigma(S_{\alpha,\beta}) \cup \{0\}$. So let $\lambda \notin \sigma(S_{\alpha,\beta}) \cup \{0\}$. We have to show that $\lambda \notin \sigma(S_{\alpha,0})$ and $\lambda \notin \sigma(S_{0,\beta})$. If $(S_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I)f = 0$, then α being analytic, $Qf = 0$ and $(\alpha - \lambda)Pf = 0$. Again $(S_\alpha - \lambda I)Pf = (\alpha - \lambda)Pf = 0$. Since $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ is injective, $Pf = 0$. hence $f = 0$. Therefore $(S_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I)$ is injective. Next, let $g \in L^2$. There exists $h \in L^2$ such that $(S_{\alpha,\beta} - \lambda I)h = Pg$. Applying the operator P both side we get $(\alpha - \lambda)Ph = Pg$. Now define $f \in L^2$ by $Pf = Ph$ and $Qf = -\frac{1}{\lambda}Qg$. With this definition of f, it is easy to see that $(S_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I)f = g$ proving the ontoness of $S_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I$. So we have proved that $S_{\alpha,0} - \lambda I$ is invertible and hence $\lambda \notin \sigma(S_{\alpha,0})$. In a similar way we can prove that $\lambda \notin \sigma(S_{0,\beta})$. □

Like the Toeplitz operator, the spectrum of $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ can be known completely provided α, β are continuous functions. Recall the definition of index of a continuous curve $\phi : S^1 \to \mathbb{C}$ at a point $a \notin \text{range}\, \phi$:

$$\text{ind}_a \phi = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\phi \frac{1}{z-a} dz.$$

The index is also called the winding number of ϕ around a. We have the following theorem giving complete information about the spectrum of $S_{\alpha,\beta}$, when α and β are continuous.

Theorem 8.4. *Let both α and β be continuous. Then*

$$\sigma(S_{\alpha,\beta}) = \text{range}\, \alpha \cup \text{range}\, \beta \cup \{a \notin (\text{range}\, \alpha \cup \text{range}\, \beta) : \text{ind}_a \alpha \neq \text{ind}_a \beta\}.$$

The proof of the above theorem is an adaptation of the method used to prove the corresponding result of Toeplitz operator (see Theorem 3.3.18, page-116, [1]). We need several lemmas.

Lemma 8.5. *Let $\alpha \in H^\infty$, $\beta \in \overline{H^\infty}$ such that their inverses exist and $\alpha^{-1} \in H^\infty$, $\beta^{-1} \in \overline{H^\infty}$. Then $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ is invertible.*

Proof. The proof follows from the fact that $S_{\alpha,\beta} f = g$ iff $Pf = \alpha^{-1}Pg$ and $Qf = \beta^{-1}Qg$; in other words, $S^{-1}_{\alpha,\beta} = S_{\alpha^{-1},\beta^{-1}}$. □

Lemma 8.6. *Let $\alpha \in L^\infty$ be such that $S_{\alpha,1}$ is invertible. Let n be an integer. Then $S_{z^n\alpha,1}$ is invertible iff $n = 0$.*

Proof. If part is obvious. So we need to show that if $n \neq 0$, then $S_{z^n\alpha,1}$ is not invertible.

Case-1 : $n > 0$. By Theorem 6.1, $S_{z^n\alpha,1} = S_{z^n,1}S_{\alpha,1}$. Note that 1 has no pre-image under $S_{z^n,1}$. Therefore $S_{z^n,1}$ is not invertible, and hence the same is true for $S_{z^n\alpha,1}$.

Case-2 : $n < 0$. Write k for $-n$ so that $s_{z^n\alpha,1} = S_{\bar{z}^k\alpha,1}$. Let P_{k-1} denotes the projection onto the space $\{f \in L^2 : \widehat{f}(m) = 0 \text{ for all}\, m \neq 0, 1, \cdots, (k-1)\}$. Then a small calculation shows that

$$S_{\bar{z}^k\alpha,1} - S_{\alpha,1}S_{\bar{z}^k,1} = \bar{z}^k(\alpha - 1)P_{k-1}.$$

Let $g = -S^{-1}_{\alpha,1}\left(\bar{z}^k(\alpha - 1)\right)$. Now, it is not hard to see that image of the space $\{f \in L^2 : \widehat{f}(0) = 1, \widehat{f}(1) = \cdots = \widehat{f}(k-1) = 0\}$ under $S_{\bar{z}^k,1}$ is the full space L^2. Therefore there is an $f \in L^2$ with $\widehat{f}(0) = 1, \widehat{f}(1) = \cdots = \widehat{f}(k-1) = 0$ such that $s_{\bar{z}^k,1}f = g$. So, the above equation, when applied on f, gives $S_{\bar{z}^k\alpha,1}f = 0$. Hence $S_{\bar{z}^k\alpha,1}$ is not invertible. □

Lemma 8.7. *Let* ϕ *be a continuous function which does not take the value* 0*. Then* $S_{\phi,1}$ *is invertible iff* $\operatorname{ind}_0 \phi = 0$*.*

Proof. Since ϕ is continuous and it does not take the value 0, there is a positive number δ such that $|\phi(e^{i\theta})| > \delta$ for all $0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi$. Certainly we can choose a trigonometric polynomial p such that $|\phi(e^{i\theta}) - p(e^{i\theta})| < \frac{\delta}{3}$ for all θ. Clearly $|p(e^{i\theta})| > \frac{2\delta}{3}$ for all θ. We define the continuous function $\psi := \frac{\phi - p}{p}$ so that $\phi = p(1+\psi)$ and $|\psi(e^{i\theta})| < \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore the continuous function $1+\psi$ can not wind around 0 so that $\operatorname{ind}_0 (1+\psi) = 0$, and hence $\operatorname{ind}_0 \phi = \operatorname{ind}_0 p + \operatorname{ind}_0 (1+\psi) = \operatorname{ind}_0 p$. Therefore it is enough to show that $S_{\phi,1}$ is invertible if and only if $\operatorname{ind}_0 p = 0$. Let n be a non negative number such that $e^{in\theta}p(e^{i\theta})$ has no non-zero Fourier coefficients corresponding to negative indices. Since p has no zero on S^1, we can factored $e^{in\theta}p(e^{i\theta})$ as

$$e^{in\theta}p(e^{i\theta}) = ce^{im\theta}\prod_1^k(e^{i\theta} - z_j)\prod_1^l(e^{i\theta} - w_j),$$

for some non negative integers m, k, l, non zero complex numbers z_j's and w_j's, where z_j's lie (strictly) inside the circle S^1 and w_j's lie (strictly) outside the circle. We can write

$$p(e^{i\theta}) = ce^{i(m-n+k)\theta}\prod_1^k(1 - z_je^{-i\theta})\prod_1^l(e^{i\theta} - w_j).$$

Since $|w_j| > 1$ and $|z_j| < 1$, it follows that $\operatorname{ind}_0 (e^{i\theta} - w_j) = 0$ and $\operatorname{ind}_0 (1 - z_je^{-i\theta}) = 0$. So, from the above equation, we get $\operatorname{ind}_0 p = m - n + k$. Therefore it is enough to show that $S_{\phi,1}$ is invertible if and only if $m - n + k = 0$.

We write p as

$$p(e^{i\theta}) = ce^{i(m-n+k)\theta}u(e^{i\theta})v(e^{i\theta}),$$

where

$$u(e^{i\theta}) = \prod_1^l(e^{i\theta} - w_j), \quad v(e^{i\theta}) = \prod_1^k(1 - z_je^{-i\theta}).$$

Note that u is analytic, v is co-analytic and both of them are continuous. Since $|w_j| > 1$ for all $j = 1, 2, \cdots l$, it follows that u^{-1} is analytic and continuous. Similarly, v^{-1} is co-analytic and continuous. Now, it is not hard to see that, $S_{\phi,1} = S_{cz^{m-n+k}(1+\psi)uv,1}$ is invertible iff $S_{cz^{m-n+k}(1+\psi)u,v^{-1}}$ is invertible. But, by Theorem 6.1, $S_{cz^{m-n+k}(1+\psi)u,v^{-1}} = S_{z^{m-n+k}(1+\psi),1}S_{cu,v^{-1}}$, and by Lemma 8.5, $S_{cu,v^{-1}}$ is invertible. Therefore we can say that $S_{\phi,1}$ is invertible iff $S_{z^{m-n+k}(1+\psi),1}$ is invertible. Hence the proof follows by Lemma 8.6 if we can show that $S_{(1+\psi),1}$ is invertible. But this is true since

$$||I - S_{(1+\psi),1}|| = ||S_{\psi,0}|| \leq ||\psi||_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2} < 1.$$

□

Now we prove Theorem 8.4.

Proof. (proof of Theorem 8.4.) Theorem 8.3 (i) implies that $\operatorname{range}\alpha \cup \operatorname{range}\beta$ is contained in $\sigma(S_{\alpha,\beta})$. Thus we only need to show that, for $a \notin \operatorname{range}\alpha \cup \operatorname{range}\beta$, $S_{\alpha,\beta} - aI$ is invertible iff $\operatorname{ind}_a \alpha = \operatorname{ind}_a \beta$. Since $a \notin \operatorname{range}\alpha \cup \operatorname{range}\beta$ iff $0 \notin \operatorname{range}(\alpha - a) \cup \operatorname{range}(\beta - a)$, $S_{\alpha,\beta} - aI = S_{\alpha-a,\beta-a}$, and $\operatorname{ind}_a \alpha = \operatorname{ind}_0 (\alpha - a)$, $\operatorname{ind}_a \beta = \operatorname{ind}_0 (\beta - a)$, we may assume that $a = 0$. Therefore we need to show the following : If α, β are never vanishing continuous functions then

$S_{\alpha,\beta}$ is invertible iff $\operatorname{ind}_0 \alpha = \operatorname{ind}_0 \beta$. Since β is never vanishing continuous function we can show that $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ is invertible iff $S_{\frac{\alpha}{\beta},1}$ is invertible. So writing $\phi = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}$, using the fact that $\operatorname{ind}_0 \frac{\alpha}{\beta} = \operatorname{ind}_0 \alpha - \operatorname{ind}_0 \beta$, our problem ultimately reduces to Lemma 8.7. Hence the proof. □

Remark 8.8. Theorem 8.4, in particular, implies that if α, β are continuous then the spectral radius of $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ is $\max\{||\alpha||_\infty, ||\beta||_\infty\}$. But we don't know whether the same is true for general α, β.

9. INJECTIVITY

In this section we discuss about the injectivity of the operators $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ and $S^*_{\alpha,\beta}$. Unlike the Toeplitz operator, the Coburn Alternative type theorem is not true for general $S_{\alpha,\beta}$.

For a measurable set $A \subset S^1$, $|A|$ denotes its usual Lebesgue measure.

Theorem 9.1. *Let α and β be non zero L^∞ functions. Let Z_α and Z_β denote the zero sets of α and β respectively.*
(i) *If $|Z_\alpha| = 0$ or $|Z_\beta| = 0$ then at least one of $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ and $S^*_{\alpha,\beta}$ is injective.*
(ii) *Let $|Z_\alpha|, |Z_\beta| \neq 0$. If $Z_\alpha \neq Z_\beta$ (in the sense of measure i.e. $|Z_\alpha \setminus Z_\beta| \neq 0$) then $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ is injective*
(iii) *Let $|Z_\alpha|, |Z_\beta| \neq 0$. $S^*_{\alpha,\beta}$ is injective iff $|Z_\alpha \cap Z_\beta| = 0$.*

Proof. (i) Without loss of generality assume that $|Z_\alpha| = 0$. Let $S_{\alpha,\beta} f = 0$ and $S^*_{\alpha,\beta} g = 0$ for some $f, g \in L^2$. We have to show that at least one of f and g is zero. Now $S^*_{\alpha,\beta} g = 0$ implies that $P(\bar{\alpha} g) + Q(\bar{\beta} g) = 0$ or $P(\bar{\alpha} g) = 0$ and $Q(\bar{\beta} g) = 0$ which is equivalent to saying that $\bar{\alpha} g$ in $H^{2\perp}$ and $\bar{\beta} g$ is in H^2. On the other hand, since $S_{\alpha,\beta} f = 0$, we have $\alpha Pf + \beta Qf = 0$. Taking conjugate and then multiplying by g we get $g\bar{\alpha}\overline{Pf} + g\bar{\beta}\overline{Qf} = 0$. Since $g\bar{\alpha}$ is in $H^{2\perp}$ and $\overline{Pf}$ is in $\overline{H^2}$, $g\bar{\alpha}\overline{Pf}$ is an L^1 function whose all the non negative Fourier coefficients are zero. Similarly $g\bar{\beta}\overline{Qf}$ is an L^1 function whose all the non positive Fourier coefficients are zero. Therefore we can conclude that $g\bar{\alpha}\overline{Pf} = g\bar{\beta}\overline{Qf} = 0$. If g is non zero then, $|Z_\alpha|$ being zero, $g\bar{\alpha}$ is non zero; therefore $\overline{Pf} = 0$ or $Pf = 0$ and hence $\beta Qf = 0$ (as $\alpha Pf + \beta Qf = 0$) so that $Qf = 0$ and thus $f = 0$.

(ii) If $Z_\alpha \neq Z_\beta$ then there is a set E of positive measure such that one of α and β is zero on E and other is non zero on each point of E. Assume that α is zero on E and β never vanishes on E. Now, if $S_{\alpha,\beta} f = 0$ i.e. $\alpha Pf + \beta Qf = 0$ then clearly Qf is zero almost every where on E. Therefore Qf must be identically zero and consequently $\alpha Pf = 0$ or $Pf = 0$ and thus $f = 0$ proving the injectivity of $S_{\alpha,\beta}$.

(iii) Let $|Z_\alpha \cap Z_\beta| = 0$. If $S^*_{\alpha,\beta} g = 0$ i.e. $P(\bar{\alpha} g) + Q(\bar{\beta} g) = 0$ then $P(\bar{\alpha} g) = 0$ and $Q(\bar{\beta} g) = 0$ or equivalently we can say $\bar{\alpha} g$ is in $H^{2\perp}$ and $\bar{\beta} g$ in H^2. Since $\bar{\alpha} g$ is zero on Z_α which has positive measure, $\bar{\alpha} g = 0$. Similarly $\bar{\beta} g = 0$. Since $|Z_\alpha \cap Z_\beta| = 0$ we must have $g = 0$. Therefore $S^*_{\alpha,\beta}$ is injective. Now let $|Z_\alpha \cap Z_\beta| \neq 0$. If we take g to be the indicator function of $Z_\alpha \cap Z_\beta$, it is easy to see that $S^*_{\alpha,\beta} g = 0$ proving the non injectivity of $S^*_{\alpha,\beta}$. □

Remark 9.2. The above theorem would be complete if we could prove the other implication of (ii) i.e if $|Z_\alpha|, |Z_\beta| \neq 0$ and $Z_\alpha = Z_\beta$ then $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ is not injective. But we don't know whether this is true in general. Whatever example we got, we saw that the result is true. We discus one such special case here : Let E be an open non empty interval in S^1. Let $\alpha, \beta \in L^\infty$ be such that both are never vanishing continuous functions on E^c and $Z_\alpha = Z_\beta = E$. It is geometrically evident that we can define never vanishing continuous functions α', β' on S^1 such that they are same as α, β respectively on E^c, as well as their winding number at 0 are same i.e. $\mathrm{ind}_0\,\alpha' = \mathrm{ind}_0\,\beta'$. Therefore, by Theorem 8.4, $S_{\alpha\prime,\beta'}$ is invertible. Hence $S_{\alpha',\beta'}f = \chi_E$ for some non zero $f \in L^2$; where χ_E denotes the indicator function of E. Since $S_{\alpha,\beta} = \chi_{E^c}S_{\alpha',\beta'}$, $S_{\alpha,\beta}f = 0$ implying the non injectivity of $S_{\alpha,\beta}$.

Like the Toeplitz operator, (i) of the above theorem has the following applications.

Corollary 9.3. *Let α, β be non zero L^∞ functions. Assume that either $|Z_\alpha| = 0$ or $|Z_\beta| = 0$ Then $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ has dense range if it is not injective.*

Proof. If $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ is not injective, by Theorem 9.1, (i), S^*_{α,β^*} is injective. If possible let the range of $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ is not dense. Then there there is a non zero g such that $\langle S_{\alpha,\beta}f, g\rangle = 0$ for all f. Therefore $\langle f, S^*_{\alpha,\beta}g\rangle = 0$ for all f. Putting $f = S^*_{\alpha,\beta}g$, we conclude that $S^*_{\alpha,\beta}g = 0$ which contradicts the injectivity of $S^*_{\alpha,\beta}$. □

Corollary 9.4. *Let α, β be non-constant L^∞ functions. Assume that at least one of α and β can not be constant on any set of positive measure. Then*

$$\Pi_0(S_{\alpha,\beta}) \cap \overline{\Pi_0(S^*_{\alpha,\beta})} = \emptyset.$$

Proof. If possible let $\lambda \in \Pi_0(S_{\alpha,\beta})$ and $\bar{\lambda} \in \Pi_0(S^*_{\alpha,\beta})$ for some complex number λ. Then there are non zero functions f and g such that $(S_{\alpha,\beta} - \lambda I)f = 0$ and $(S^*_{\alpha,\beta} - \bar{\lambda}I)g = 0$. But these are equivalent to saying that $S_{\alpha-\lambda,\beta-\lambda}f = 0$ and $S^*_{\alpha-\lambda,\beta-\lambda}g = 0$ so that both $S_{\alpha-\lambda,\beta-\lambda}$ and $S^*_{\alpha-\lambda,\beta-\lambda}$ are not injective contradicting (i) of Theorem 9.1. □

Corollary 9.5. *Let α, β are non-constant real-valued L^∞ functions such that at least one of α and β can not be constant on any set of positive measure. Also assume that $\alpha - \beta$ is a real constant. Then point spectrum of $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ is empty.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.1 in [10], $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ is self-adjoint. If possible let $\lambda \in \Pi_0(S_{\alpha,\beta})$. Since $S_{\alpha,\beta}$ is self adjoint λ must be real and it is also in the point spectrum of $S^*_{\alpha,\beta}$. This implies a contradiction to the previous corollary. □

REFERENCES

[1] Martnez-Avendao, Rubn A.; Rosenthal, Peter. *An introduction to operators on the Hardy-Hilbert space,* Springer, Berlin (2007).

[2] Gohberg, I., Krupnik, N. *One-dimensional linear singular integral equations,* Vol. 1. Birkhuser, Basel (1992).

[3] Nakazi, T., Yamamoto, T. *Some singular integral operators and Helson-Szeg measures,* J. Funct. Anal. 88 (1990), no. 2, 366-384.

[4] Nakazi, T., Yamamoto, T. *Weighted norm inequalities for some singular integral operators,* J. Funct. Anal. 148 (1997), no. 2, 279-295.

[5] Nakazi, T., Yamamoto, T. *Norms of some singular integral operators and their inverse operators,* J. Operator Theory 40 (1998), no. 1, 185-207.

[6] Nakazi, T. *Essential norms of some singular integral operators,* Arch. Math. (Basel) 73 (1999), no. 6, 439-441.

[7] Nakazi, T. *Norm inequalities for some singular integral operators,* Math. Inequal. Appl. 3 (2000), no. 3, 411-421.

[8] Nakazi, T., Yamamoto, T. *Norms and essential norms of the singular integral operator with Cauchy kernel on weighted Lebesgue spaces*, Integral Equations Operator Theory 68 (2010), no. 1, 101-113.

[9] Nakazi, T. *Norm inequality of* $AP + BQ$ *for selfadjoint projections* P *and* Q *with* $PQ = 0$, J. Math. Inequal. 7 (2013), no. 3, 513-516.

[10] Nakazi, T., Yamamoto, T. *Normal singular integral operators with Cauchy kernel on* L^2, Integral Equations Operator Theory 78 (2014), no. 2, 233-248.

[11] Yamamoto, T. *Invertibility of some singular integral operators and a lifting theorem*, Hokkaido Math. J. 22 (1993), no. 2, 181-198.

[12] Yamamoto, T. *Boundedness of some singular integral operators in weighted* L^2 *spaces*, J. Operator Theory 32 (1994), no. 2, 243-254.

AMIT SAMANTA, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, KANPUR-208016, INDIA

E-mail address: `amit.gablu@gmail.com, asamanta@iitk.ac.in`

SANTANU SARKAR, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE WEIZMANN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, P.O. BOX 26, REHOVOT-7610001, ISRAEL

E-mail address: `santanu87@gmail.com, santanu.sarkar@weizmann.ac.il`